

Remarks

Reconsideration of this application is requested. By this amendment, claims 1, 13, and 18 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-20 remain in the application.

Response to 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection of claims 1, 5, 6, 12, 13, 18 and 19

The Office action rejects claims 1, 5, 6, 12, 13, 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Humphrey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,476,486) in view of Mart et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,563,838). Applicants believe this rejection has been overcome in view of the amendments made above and the remarks that follow.

THE INDEPENDENT CLAIMS INCLUDE LIMITATIONS THAT ARE NOT TAUGHT OR SUGGESTED BY THE COMBINATION OF HUMPHREY ET AL. AND MART ET AL.

It is well established that obviousness requires a teaching or a suggestion by the relied upon prior art of all the elements of a claim (M.P.E.P. §2142). Without conceding the appropriateness of the combination, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Humphrey et al. and Mart et al. does not meet the requirements of an obvious rejection in that neither teaches nor suggests a charge pump circuit.

Since Humphrey et al. and Mart et al., taken separately, are devoid of any teaching or suggestion of all of the limitations recited in claims 1, 13, and 18, the combination of Humphrey et al. and Mart et al. must necessarily be devoid of the required teaching or suggestion of all the elements recited in claims 1, 13, and 18. Consequently, the combination cannot make Applicants' claims 1, 13, or 18 obvious. Since the cited documents do not teach or suggest all the limitations of Applicants' claim 1, 13, and 18, it is believed that the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn and that these claims are in condition for allowance.

Claims 5, 6, and 12 depend from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons as claim 1. Claim 19 depends from claim 18 and is believed to be allowable for the same reasons as claim 18.

Response to 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection of claims 2-4, 7-10, and 14-17

The Office action rejects claims 2-4, 7-10, and 14-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Humphrey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,476,486) in view of Mart et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,563,838) as applied to claims 1, 5, 6, 12, 13, 18, and 19, and further in view of Spielberger (U.S. Patent No. 6,005,778). Applicants believe this rejection has been overcome in view of the amendments made above and the remarks that follow.

Claims 2-4 and 7-10 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 14-17

depend either directly or indirectly from claim 13 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons as claim 13.

Response to 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection of claim 11

The Office action rejects claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Humphrey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,476,486) in view of Mart et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,563,838) as applied to claims 1, 5, 6, 12, 13, 18, and 19, and further in view of Javanifard et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,385,033). Applicants believe this rejection has been overcome in view of the amendments made above and the remarks that follow.

Claim 11 depends from claim 1 and is believed to be allowable for the same reasons as claim 1.

Response to 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection of claim 20

The Office action rejects claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Humphrey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,476,486) in view of Mart et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,563,838) as applied to claims 1, 5, 6, 12, 13, 18, and 19, and further in view of Sundstrom (U.S. Patent No. 5,864,177). Applicants believe this rejection has been overcome in view of the amendments made above and the remarks that follow.

Claim 20 depends from claim 18 and is believed to be allowable for the same reasons as claim 18.

Conclusion

In view of all of the above, it is believed that Applicants' claims are allowable, and the case is in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited. Reconsideration of the rejections and objections is respectfully requested.

Should it be determined that an additional fee is due under 37 CFR §§1.16 or 1.17, or any excess fee has been received, please charge that fee or credit the amount of overcharge to deposit account #02-2666.

If the Examiner believes that there are any informalities that can be corrected by an Examiner's amendment, a telephone call to the undersigned at (480) 552-0624 is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Eleanor P. Rabadam et al.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Paul A. Mendonsa", written in a cursive style.

Paul A. Mendonsa
Patent Attorney
Reg. No. 42,879

Dated: May 12, 2004

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP
12400 Wilshire Blvd., Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 264-0967